

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This amendment responds to the Office Action dated November 1, 2007, in which the Examiner rejected claims 13-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

As indicated above, claims 13-24 have been amended in order to make explicit what is implicit in the claims. The amendment is unrelated to a statutory requirement for patentability.

Claim 13 claims a recording/reproducing apparatus and claim 19 claims a recording/reproducing method. The apparatus and method record video or audio into a recording medium and reproduce the video or audio from the recording medium. The method and apparatus comprise recording video or audio signals and identifying signals indicating the content of the audio or video signals into a recording medium. A title list of videos or audios recorded in the recording medium is generated using the identifying signals. One or more videos or audios in the list is reproduced. Upon user selection of playback, part of each video or audio in the title is sequentially reproduced.

By sequentially reproducing part of each video or audio in the title list upon user selection of playback, as claimed in claims 13 and 19, the claimed invention provides a recording/reproducing apparatus or method which enables a user to easily operate a device using a display. The prior art does not show, teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 13 and 19.

Claims 13-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over *Tsumagari, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,480,669), in view of *Downs, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,574,609).

Tsumagari, et al. appears to disclose allowing a user to insert an entry point (bookmark) at an arbitrary recording position of video data, audio data and the like. Nothing in *Tsumagari*,

et al. discloses, shows, teaches or suggests sequentially reproducing part of each video or audio in a title list upon user selection of playback as claimed in claims 13 and 19. Rather, *Tsumagari, et al.* only discloses allowing a user to insert a bookmark at an arbitrary recording position.

Downs, et al. appears to disclose a digital content library which allows sorting of a play list by name, category or key word (Col. 85, lines 56-67). Nothing in *Downs, et al.* discloses, shows, teaches or suggests sequentially reproducing part of each video or audio in a title list upon user selection of playback as claimed in claims 13 and 19. Rather, *Downs, et al.* only discloses sorting by name, category and key word.

A combination of *Tsumagari, et al.* and *Downs, et al.* would merely suggest to insert bookmarks at arbitrary positions of data as taught by *Tsumagari, et al.* while sorting the data as taught by *Downs, et al.* Thus, nothing in the combination of the references discloses, shows, teaches or suggests sequentially reproducing part of each video or audio in a title list upon user selection of playback as claimed in claims 13 and 19. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 13 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claims 14-18 and 20-24 depend from claims 13 and 19 and recite additional features. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 14-18 and 20-24 would not have been obvious within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 103 over *Tsumagari, et al.* and *Downs, et al.* at least for the reasons as set forth above. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 14-18 and 20-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

The prior art of record, which is not relied upon, is acknowledged. The references taken singularly or in combination does not show, teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 13-24.

Thus, it now appears that the application is in condition for a reconsideration and allowance. Reconsideration and allowance at an early date are respectfully requested. Should the Examiner find that the application is not now in condition for allowance, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner enters this amendment for purposes of appeal.

CONCLUSION

If for any reason the Examiner feels that the application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact, by telephone, the Applicants' undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed within the currently set shortened statutory period, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such extension of time may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In the event that any additional fees are due with this paper, please charge our Deposit Account No. 05-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

Frommer Lawrence & Haug LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By: 

Ellen Marcie Emas
Reg. No. 32,131
(202) 292-1530

Date: December 19, 2007